

1-1964

Report to the Board of Trustees by the Faculty Committee on Fraternities

Univeristy of Maine

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/univ_publications



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [History Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Univeristy of Maine, "Report to the Board of Trustees by the Faculty Committee on Fraternities" (1964). *General University of Maine Publications*. 257.

https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/univ_publications/257

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UMaine. It has been accepted for inclusion in General University of Maine Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UMaine. For more information, please contact um.library.technical.services@maine.edu.

Univ
M.C.
Box 296

Fraternities - General, 1950 -

UNIVERSITY COLLECTION

UNIVERSITY COLLECTION
VERTICAL FILE

RAYMOND H. FOGLER LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF MAINE
ORONO, MAINE

REPORT TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

by the

FACULTY COMMITTEE ON FRATERNITIES

January, 1964

(Nolde Report)

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE
ORONO, MAINE

REPORT TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
by the
SPECIAL FACULTY COMMITTEE ON FRATERNITIES

January, 1964

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. The Historical Background: a survey of the origins and growth of the fraternity system at the University of Maine
- II. The Current Status of the Fraternity System: a study of its physical, financial, academic, and structural characteristics
- III. An Evaluation: an examination of the extent to which the existing fraternity system contributes, or can contribute, to the purposes and values of the University of Maine
- IV. Recommendations: courses of action which, if energetically implemented, should serve to make the fraternity system a useful adjunct to the University of Maine
- V. Summary

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMITTEE

The Faculty Committee on Fraternities was created by action of the Board of Trustees of the University of Maine on November 21, 1962. On that date President Lloyd H. Elliott was directed by the Trustees "to appoint a faculty committee to make a thorough study of fraternities and sororities at the University of Maine, particularly their relationship to the purposes and values of the institution."

The Committee appointed by President Elliott on December 6, 1962 consisted of:

Professor W. Murray Bain
Professor Cecil S. Brown
Professor Llewellyn E. Clark
(on leave, 1963-1964)
Professor Hilda M. Fife
Professor Matthew McNeary
Professor John J. Nolde, Chairman
Professor Robert B. Rhoads

On June 3, 1963 the Committee, finding the task more complicated than expected, requested of the Trustees that its task be limited for the time being to a study of the fraternity system alone, the sororities to be studied at a later date. The request was granted by the Trustees on September 18, 1963. This report is the result of the Committee's study of the fraternities at the University of Maine.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The growth of the fraternity system

The fraternity system at the University of Maine began with the establishment at Orono of a group styling itself the Q.T.V. Society. According to Fernald's History of the University of Maine, the Q.T.V. Society was founded at the Massachusetts Agricultural College in 1869, and a chapter of that organization was installed on the Maine campus in 1874. While initial faculty reaction to the fraternity seems to have been something less than enthusiastic, the organization apparently gained the support of the Board of Trustees, for Fernald writes that in 1875 "a statement of the principles and objects of the fraternity was laid before the Trustees which proved satisfactory to that body" (Fernald, p. 364). The following year the Trustees "voted that the Q.T.V. Society have permission to erect a building upon the college grounds, the style and location thereof to be subject to approval of the Trustees." (Board of Trustees action re; fraternities, p. 1, hereafter cited as BOTARF).

The establishment of other fraternities followed quickly. In 1878 an Alpha Sigma Chi fraternity was formed and a year later merged with Beta Theta Pi, adopting the latter's name. A third fraternity appeared on the campus in 1886, when the K.K.F. Society, formed in 1884, was granted a charter by Kappa Sigma. Alpha Tau Omega established a chapter in Orono in 1891, Phi Kappa Sigma in 1898, Sigma Alpha Epsilon in 1901, Sigma Chi in 1902, Phi Eta Kappa in 1906, Theta Chi in 1907, Delta Tau Delta in 1908, and Lambda Chi Alpha and Sigma Nu in 1913. The Q.T.V. Society had in the meantime (1899) become a chapter of Phi Gamma Delta. In 1916 the Phi Epsilon Pi fraternity was established. By this time, on the eve of U.S. entry into World War I, there were thirteen fraternities at the University of Maine. Of these, only Phi Eta Kappa was a "local".

The system continued to expand after the war. While Phi Epsilon Pi closed in 1925, Phi Mu Delta appeared in 1923, Alpha Gamma Rho in 1924, Tau Epsilon Pi in 1929, and four additional fraternities (Sigma Phi Sigma, Beta Kappa, Phi Kappa, and Eta Nu Pi) which failed to survive the depression years. In 1929 the Trustees decided that the expansion of the system should be halted and in February of that year voted that "it is the opinion of the Trustees that the number of fraternities, both national and local, is fully adequate to meet the needs of the students at the present time. The President of the University is hereby instructed not to grant requests looking toward an increase in their numbers." (BOTARF, p.19) By this time the fraternity system was housing approximately 600 of the 1,104 men students. The University itself provided housing for only 248 male students. The remaining male students lived "off campus".

The question of permitting new fraternities on campus was re-opened in 1947. In May of that year the Trustees voted "that President Chase appoint a committee to re-examine University policy regarding the organization of new fraternities at the University of Maine" (BOTARF, p. 32), and in August of the same year it was recorded that "the Board felt, because of increased enrollment, that it might permit the establishment of a few more fraternities." Two new chapters, Sigma Phi Epsilon and Tau Kappa Epsilon, were formed as a result. The expansionist mood lasted only a short time, however, for on March 18, 1949, the Trustees voted that "it seemed unwise to increase the number of fraternities at the University of Maine at this time." (BOTARF, p. 42)

It seems clear that the University played a major role in the financing of fraternity house construction. In 1903 the Maine legislature passed an act authorizing the Trustees to guarantee loans for the construction of fraternity houses. The first house to be built under this

arrangement, that of Phi Kappa Sigma, was completed in 1903. Fernald records that all the fraternity houses on campus by 1915 had been built with substantial University help (p. 368-69). Of this group those still used as fraternity houses are the buildings of Phi Kappa Sigma, Beta Theta Pi, Phi Eta Kappa, and Sigma Nu. The house currently used by Kappa Sigma was built in 1895, apparently without University financial aid.

Presumably, the group of fraternities founded in the 1920's and those built or rebuilt in the 1930's were financed in a similar fashion. University financial aid continued after World War II. Since 1945, the University has loaned various fraternities \$283,700 for house construction or renovation.

The fraternity system at its height

The fraternity system probably contributed much to the University of Maine during the decades prior to World War II. In 1930 there were 19 chapters on the campus. These were capable of providing room and board for approximately 600 men, about 60% of the total male enrollment. Total fraternity membership was probably higher. By 1941, despite an increase in male enrollment of about 50%, the fraternities still provided housing for about 35% of male students. Four of these houses were quite new, having been built during the previous eight years. Two were less than twenty years old. The group of houses built during the first decade and a half of the century were still less than forty years old and presumably in good condition. As far as can be discovered only two fraternity houses had been built prior to the turn of the century.

Those who were part of the system during these years recall a high spirit and esprit d'corps. In the absence of a student union and the social affairs now provided by the dormitories, the fraternities provided

the sole source of social activity. In the easy-going academic atmosphere of the 1920's and 1930's, the fraternity system did not interfere significantly with the intellectual pursuits of its members. In those days the academic pressures were not as great as they are today.

The picture was, of course, not all bright. Fraternity activity may have helped foment a serious town-gown controversy. Hazing reached scandalous proportions. Lack of financial foresight may have contributed to the rapid physical decline of the houses which set in after 1945.

Yet the fact remains that the fraternity system, given the atmosphere of the times, was, in general, a useful, and probably constructive, institution.

The decline of the fraternity system

The war years changed all this. In the first place the academic atmosphere changed, as it had throughout the country. More and more emphasis on intellectual achievement brought greater pressure to bear on almost every student. Yet the fraternities made little effort to keep in step and continued to operate as if nothing had changed since 1941. Demands on students' time, physical and mental hazing, the perpetuation of anachronistic traditions and practices, indicated that the fraternities had little understanding of what was going on in the world around them.

Furthermore, a new breed of men dominated fraternity affairs in the immediate post-war years. These were the veterans, who were older and had "been around". The spirit of fraternalism probably meant little to them. To them the chapter house was merely a place to sleep, eat, and drink. The "style" of the earlier years seems to have disappeared. University rules were increasingly violated, though some kind of internal discipline may have kept many of these violations from coming to the attention of the

authorities. There is some evidence that the authorities, themselves, were reluctant to enforce the rules.

When the veteran era came to an end, fraternity leadership reverted to the younger, less mature and less sophisticated, generation. These boys had no knowledge of the Golden Age of the fraternity system which may have existed in the pre-war years. Moreover, they continued to act as their elders, the veterans, had acted but with perhaps less savoir faire. This new, younger, generation was no more aware of the new pace the University was setting than their predecessors had been.

Nor was it only that the rest of the academic world was passing the fraternities by. There seems to have set in during these years a decline within the system itself.

THE CURRENT STATUS OF THE FRATERNITY SYSTEM

In an effort to determine the present status of the fraternity system at the University of Maine, the Committee has held twenty meetings between January, 1963, and January, 1964. Extensive interviews were held with individual fraternity men, fraternity advisors, the personnel deans, the University treasurer, the University registrar, the University President, and the Interfraternity Council. Data was collected as to the physical, financial, and academic status of the fraternity system. Each house was visited by a Committee "team". Numerous evaluations and reports done at other Universities were studied. The Committee made certain that its tasks and objectives were aired in the student newspaper. The chairman of the Committee made it known that he would be willing to talk frankly with the membership of any fraternity on campus and, as a result, was asked by two houses to discuss the "fraternity problem" with them.

The physical plant

The Committee has visited every fraternity on campus during the past semester. Each visit consisted of a thorough tour, the object being to determine the physical condition of the house visited. We were concerned not with day-to-day housekeeping but with: structural soundness; adequacy of basic equipment such as kitchen and toilet facilities; distribution and arrangement of rooms, especially as the latter concerned adequate study facilities; and with the general suitability for fraternity living. Despite the fact that the University has loaned various fraternities \$283,700.00 since 1945, the Committee could classify only one house as being in "excellent" condition. At the risk of being rather arbitrary, the Committee has characterized the physical condition of the fraternities in the following fashion:*

"Excellent".....Sigma Chi.....built as a fraternity in 1935

"Good".....Alpha Tau Omega....built as a fraternity in 1933

Delta Tau Delta....built as a fraternity in 1941

Phi Gamma Delta....built as a fraternity in 1924

Phi Kappa Sigma....built as a fraternity in 1903

Sigma Phi Epsilon..built as a fraternity in 1958

Theta Chi.....built as a fraternity in 1960

"Fair".....Alpha Gamma Rho....built as a private home in

1907 and converted into a

fraternity in 1938

Lambda Chi Alpha...built as a fraternity in 1926

Phi Eta Kappa.....built as a fraternity in 1908

Sigma Nu.....built as a fraternity in 1915

*There is no significance to the relative arrangement within each category other than alphabetical.

"Poor".....Beta Theta Pi.....built as a fraternity in 1905

Kappa Sigma.....built as a fraternity in 1895

Phi Mu Delta.....built as a private home prior

to 1907 and converted into a

fraternity in 1924

Tau Epsilon Phi....built as a private home in 1885

and converted into a fraternity

in 1949

Tau Kappa Epsilon..built as a private home at an

unknown date and converted into

a fraternity in 1953

The Committee feels that with adequate funds for maintenance and repair, the houses in the first two categories can continue to provide decent housing for undergraduates for some time to come. The houses in the "fair" category present a problem. Most of these are over fifty years old. That they are even in the "fair" category is due to the fact that the active members and alumni have done an excellent job with almost impossible material. At present the living conditions in this group of houses is adequate, but it is doubtful that the houses can be maintained at this level as the years go by.

As for the "poor" category, the Committee feels that these houses are in such deplorable condition that there is a serious doubt as to whether they should continue to serve as undergraduate housing without major renovation. In most cases the toilet facilities are totally inadequate. With few exceptions the study rooms lack adequate furniture, are generally shabby, and seem hardly conducive to any kind of concentration. In one case we found small desks, illuminated by a single bulb hung from a roof joist, tucked away in odd corners directly under the roof. Blankets were

strung between roof joists to keep out the cold.

Many of the houses in all categories are dangerous fire hazards. Few are decorated with any degree of taste. The lounges and dining rooms are dull and drab. Few art works of merit were found. An atmosphere of genteel, tasteful living....the kind that would contribute to the teaching of the social graces that the fraternities talk about....was rarely present.

It should be noted here that chapter houses which have been converted from private homes are, without exception, in the lower categories. Clearly, houses of this kind are less than adequate for undergraduate housing.

Financial Condition

A second indication of the decline, or at least weakness, of the fraternity system...and this is linked, of course, to the first...is its poor financial condition. In a report to the trustees dated June 8, 1963, Mr. George Crosby, Registrar and Director of Student Services, rated the fraternities' financial status as follows:*

"Excellent condition".....Alpha Gamma Rho

Delta Tau Delta

Sigma Chi

"Good condition".....Phi Eta Kappa

Phi Kappa Sigma

Tau Kappa Epsilon

"Fair condition".....Beta Theta Pi

Lambda Chi Alpha

Sigma Phi Epsilon

*A more accurate, and probably more favorable, picture may be obtained from a survey of the fraternities' financial records as of September 1st rather than June 8th, since as of the latter date the books for the spring semester had not yet been closed.

"Poor condition".....Alpha Tau Omega

Phi Gamma Delta

Phi Mu Delta

Tau Epsilon Pi

"Very serious difficulty"..Kappa Sigma

"Seemingly hopelessly

in debt".....Sigma Nu

Theta Chi

Reasons for this poor financial record are many. Most weaker fraternities have not been able to fill their houses to the listed capacity. Poor bookkeeping and bad, if not non-existent, financial advice is a contributing factor. The high taxes paid to the town of Orono place an unusually heavy burden upon the system. The Committee also feels that the fraternities are making a serious mistake in trying to compete with University housing costs. In 1962, for example, the fraternities seemed proud of the fact that the median cost for each member in the system for the academic year 1961-62 was \$740.00, or \$10.00 less than the cost of living in a University dormitory (Fraternity Life at the University of Maine). How a fraternity can provide the student with those extra things which make fraternity living what it is supposed to be and at the same time maintain a solvent operation with present financial policy is difficult to understand.

It may be that the physical decline of the houses themselves and the financial plight of the active chapters may be traced to lack of enthusiastic alumni support in the first case and lack of adequate advisor-supervision in the second. Had the alumni of the pre-war years provided adequate financial help and had adequate sinking funds been established, it is quite possible that the physical deterioration of the houses would not

have taken place as rapidly as it did. Had the chapter advisors maintained better supervision of the day to day financial management of the houses it is probable that the fiscal conditions noted by Mr. Crosby would not have occurred. Almost without exception those houses listed as being in "excellent" or "good" financial condition are blessed with chapter advisors who take a deep and continuing interest in the affairs of their fraternity.

Scholastic achievement:

It has been generally assumed that the academic level of the fraternity system has also declined in recent years. To some extent this is true. An analysis of the fifty-nine semesters from the fall of 1930 through the fall of 1962 shows that 30% of the fraternities were above the all-men average more than half the semesters and that the all-fraternity average was above the all-men average 76% of the time. During the past decade, 1952-1962, only 58% of the fraternities were above the all-men average more than half the semesters involved, though, oddly enough, the all-fraternity average was above the all-men average more than 81% of the time. These figures are to some extent weighted in favor of the fraternities, since present rules require that no freshman with an average less than 1.8 can be pledged, and the all-men average included many freshmen who were well below this mark. It should be remembered, also, that the fraternity averages are included in the all-men average.

One significant figure in the area of scholarship appears when a comparison is made between the academic record of a freshman pledge and his record the following semester when he becomes active in fraternity affairs. The accumulative point average of all freshmen pledged to fraternities in the spring of 1962 averaged 2.25. The point average of this same group of men for the fall semester 1962, during which they moved

into the house and were initiated, was 1.94. In the case of one house the figure dropped from 2.41 to 1.68. In contrast a similar comparison for non-fraternity dormitory sophomores shows an increase from 2.41 to 2.42. By the end of the spring semester of 1963, the point averages of the fraternity sophomores still remained well below what it had been at the end of their freshman year.

It is the Committee's view that the fraternities contribute little to the academic life of the University. If anything, through harmful initiation practices and the presence in many houses of a supply of term papers and reports which can be plagiarized, they have a negative influence. There are, of course, exceptions. During the 59 semesters between 1930 and 1962, Alpha Gamma Rho has been above the all-men average 100% of the time, Phi Kappa Sigma 78% of the time, and Tau Epsilon Pi 71% of the time. But these exceptions do not alter the general impression that the fraternity system is anti-intellectual and probably has always been so.

Internal organization and structure

An increasing concern has been the number of times that the University has been forced to take disciplinary action against its members in recent years. In the ten years between April 1953 and May 1963, the University or the Interfraternity Council has disciplined a fraternity forty-six times. Five houses have been chronic offenders, accounting for twenty-six of the forty-six incidents. One house alone was disciplined five times between February, 1962, and March, 1963. Most of these cases have stemmed from violations of the University's "no-drinking" rule. The rather sudden increase in cases of this sort is probably a result of two facts: a breakdown in the internal discipline of many houses, as a result of which the drinking, which has been going on for years in the fraternities

but which had been kept under control, got out of hand; and a stiffer attitude on the part of the University administration beginning about 1952-1953 and especially since 1957-58. The latter, of course, stems largely from the former. In earlier years what drinking was done in the fraternities was kept more or less under control. Strong house leadership and the esprit d'corps mentioned earlier account for this. During the veteran era the amount of drinking probably increased, but the imbibers were usually reasonably mature ex-service men, most of whom knew how to handle it and saw to it that those who didn't were kept out of sight. Meanwhile, the new, younger generation was working its way into and up through the system, and when the veterans left, they found themselves in positions of leadership. The trouble lay in the fact that those now in a position of leadership were unable to cope with the drinking problem and the University, which for years had itself worked out a system for handling the matter, was now faced with the need to act. To this must be added the appearance, in 1958, of a new University President who had his own firm ideas on the subject. The result has been clear.

In the Committee's view the increase in violations of the "no-drinking" rule is a direct reflection of the internal weakness in the entire fraternity system. Forceful leadership within each house, as well as within the Interfraternity Council, would have seen to it that no drinking would be permitted in the fraternities, or, at least, would have established such control over it that never, or rarely, would it come to the official attention of the University. Whether the fraternities like it or not, the present administration has made clear its intent to operate according to the letter of the State law on alcoholic beverages. The statement issued recently by Messrs. Crosby and Stewart and Miss Zink should bring to an end any doubt as to where the University stands on the matter.

Whatever the causes, the situation had disintegrated by November, 1962, to the point where eight of the seventeen houses on campus were under some kind of University censure. One of those, Sigma Alpha Epsilon, was closed.

A major problem within the fraternity system has been the relative impotence of the Interfraternity Council. This body consists of one representative, either the President, Vice-President, or Past President, from each house. The leadership of the Council rests with its five man Executive Council. Its weakness lies in the fact that it is either unable or unwilling to initiate policy or take action which it knows will not receive the approval of every fraternity on campus. In effect, then, each individual fraternity is in a position to inform the I.F.C. whether it will or will not abide by an I.F.C. decision, and the I.F.C. rarely acts if it is of the opinion that one or more houses disapprove of the action contemplated.

Two consequences result from this weakness. First, the Interfraternity Council has found it difficult, if not impossible, to check the general decline of the fraternity system by passing and enforcing the rules needed to bring about order and discipline within the system. Secondly, the anarchy thus created has brought about considerable internal dissension. The Committee has sensed more than a little back-biting and bickering. One house accuses another of "squealing to the authorities". Many houses tend to become isolated islands, separating themselves not only from the University community but from other fraternities. A healthy rivalry within the system has become almost non-existent.

Another problem has been the system of "advisors". The Committee has concluded that in almost every case where a fraternity can be classed as "strong" (or "best", or "excellent") the presence of capable, knowledgeable,

and dedicated advisors is apparent. While generalizations in an area such as this are dangerous and often unfair, the Committee is compelled to point out that the advisors to the weakest houses in recent years are men who have little, if any, contact with everyday University affairs, or if they do, either their degree of experience has not been extensive or they have little real understanding of the fraternity problem.

It must be noted at this point that the decline of the fraternity system at the University of Maine may simply be a result of what one member of the Committee is wont to call "the inexorable forces of history". As the University assumes more and more responsibility for the housing and feeding of male students and the dormitories undertake to provide centers for social activity, the fraternities find their former role on campus disappearing. As of the fall of 1963 the University provided housing for 53% of the male enrollment, whereas in 1930 it housed only 22% of the male students. The percentage of male students capable of being housed by fraternities dropped from about 60% to 22% during the same years. Furthermore, the character of the way of life of young Americans...their pattern of living...is changing. The automobile is a case in point. In the 1920's and 1930's, it is doubtful that the number of automobiles owned by fraternity men was more than two or three per house. In those days fraternity men, and, for that matter, most students, remained "on campus" far more than they do today. This was especially true on weekends. Today the parking lots of the fraternities are packed, and more often than not Friday afternoon witnesses a grand exodus. Even during the week, the transportation available to the student makes it possible to "go into town" at a moment's notice. Dates are taken off campus for evenings or weekends. How the old role of the fraternities can be played in the face of this technological revolution is hard to see. Furthermore, the academic pressure upon students is far

heavier today than it was 30 years ago; students are simply less willing to spend time on fraternity affairs than in the past. The matter is further compounded by the fact that more and more students contemplate the possibility of graduate work and cannot afford the wretched study conditions that exist in many of the fraternities. The fact that only about 50% of all fraternity men actually live in their houses...even though the houses are not occupied to capacity...is significant here.

AN EVALUATION

The Trustees' charge to this Committee was "to make a thorough study of the fraternities...at the University of Maine, particularly their relationship to the purposes and values of the institution."

In the view of the Committee, the purpose of the University of Maine, or of any American university, is, among other things, to make its students aware of the liberal and practical arts necessary for a successful and humane functioning of their society and to provide the intellectual and cultural atmosphere in which this best can take place.

Taken in this light, the picture of the fraternity system at the University of Maine is a gloomy one.

As the above survey indicates, the fraternities' original raison d'etre, to provide room, board, and social activities for male undergraduates, is rapidly disappearing. The University is usurping much of this original function. The physical plant of the fraternity system is rapidly disintegrating. Its financial condition leaves much to be desired. Academically it contributes little. Internally, it has been weakened by non-existent, incapable, or indecisive leadership, and this probably has had a generally

demoralizing effect upon the entire student body. The "advisor" system is not what it should be.

Yet, in spite of the above comments, the picture is not entirely dark. There are pockets of brightness. The fraternity system at Maine has never been plagued by the snobbery which exists on many campuses. There may, in fact, not be enough of a feeling of eliteness among the fraternity men.

The problem of racial and religious discrimination seems not to be as much of a problem as elsewhere. According to the Dean of Men, nine houses have no constitutional barriers to the admission of students of any race, color, or creed: two houses still limit their membership to "White, Christian"; one house will initiate only "whites"; two houses are listed as having "local option"; the status of two houses is unclear. While it is deplorable that discrimination on the basis of race, color, or creed exists, it seems clear that the situation is not nearly as bad as it was 20 or 30 years ago, when most fraternities adhered to the WASP (white, anglo-saxon, protestant) philosophy.

A number of houses provide a tasteful and comfortable atmosphere, conducive both to cultured living and academic pursuits. Furthermore, the fraternities, or at least some of them, do provide a haven for the student who may find himself lost in the massive anonymity of the large dormitories. They provide the student body with campus leaders far in excess of their numbers. They still provide the major centers for social activity on campus, though the dormitories are challenging them here. They contribute something to town affairs through their muscular dystrophy drives, community clean-ups, and Christmas parties for children.

Furthermore, a new spirit among the fraternity leaders seems to be developing. A Junior IFC has been formed, made up of the leaders of the

various pledge classes, whose purpose it is to bring about true interfraternity cooperation at the beginning of a fraternity man's life on campus. The University's Assistant Treasurer has been conducting regular meetings of all fraternity financial officers in an effort to bring about a higher degree of financial responsibility within the system. During the past year several houses have made concerted efforts to rid themselves of members who would simply not abide by the "no-drinking" rule. The mere existence of the Committee has forced almost all the houses to re-evaluate themselves and their programs, and in a number of cases constructive results have been achieved. These are encouraging signs, and they tend to mitigate some of the grimmer aspects of the portrait painted in earlier parts of this report.

Finally, the Committee feels that a fraternity system, properly structured and organized, is needed on the University campus. Such a system would have as one of its major foci the academic achievement of its members. It could provide its membership with an atmosphere of tasteful living in which, among other things, the boy who feels lost in the dormitories can find companionship. It could act as the generator and organizer of the Maine Spirit. It could be a group of men proud of the unique role they play on campus.

In the light of the above the Committee feels that while the fraternity system at present contributes little to the purposes and values of the University of Maine, there is no reason why it cannot be rebuilt and reconstructed in such a way as to contribute significantly to those purposes and values. We think it should be given a chance.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Physical and fiscal:

- a. Assuming that the Board of Trustees has the right and duty to determine the adequacy of the living conditions of students housed at the University of Maine, it is recommended that the Trustees appoint a Standing Fraternity Committee, consisting of the Assistant Dean of Men for Fraternity Affairs (see below, Sec. 3a), the Director of Student Services, the Director of Residences, the Regional Director of one of the national fraternities, one faculty member, a professionally trained architect, and the Chairman of the University of Maine Fraternity Advisors Group. The task of the Standing Fraternity Committee will be to determine by annual inspection, according to a scale suitable to itself, the physical status of each house and to recommend that certain alterations, repairs, and renovations be made whenever any house fails to measure up to a minimum standard. Any house classified "sub-standard" will be given a specific deadline to raise the funds needed to accomplish the necessary changes and an additional year to complete said alterations. If this task is not completed within the specified time, the chapter's charter will be withdrawn.
- b. It is recommended that the House Corporation of each fraternity be required to submit to the Standing Fraternity Committee some time before the latter's first annual inspection a Ten Year Plan for House Improvement. The Ten Year Plan should include plans for major changes, alterations, renovations, etc., for the following decade, with approximate costs and possible source of funds.

- c. It is recommended that, subsequent to the completion of the first annual visit of the Standing Fraternity Committee, the submission of its report, and the submission of the House Corporations' Ten Year Plans, the University itself prepare a ten year plan of possible financial and other support for the implementation of such long-range programs as seem to emerge.
- d. In an effort to strengthen the month by month financial operations of the fraternities it is recommended that each fraternity at a specified date submit to the Assistant Dean of Men for Fraternities a record of a yearly audit performed by a Certified Public Accountant. If, in the judgement of the Assistant Dean, in consultation with the University Treasurer, a fraternity appears to be in poor, or worse, financial condition for more than two consecutive years, said fraternity will be placed on financial probation. If at the end of two additional years there is no significant improvement, the chapter's charter will be withdrawn.
- e. It is recommended that the Trustees take a firm attitude toward those fraternities which are making little or no effort to retire their debts to the University. If a fraternity is delinquent for more than two years, the University should call its notes, assume control of the property, and, depending on its condition, convert it to University use.

2. Academic:

- a. It is recommended that any fraternity which has had a point average below that of the all-Sophomore-Junior-Senior-average for four consecutive semesters be placed on academic probation. If, after two additional semesters, the fraternity is still below the all-Sophomore-Junior-Senior-average, its pledge class will not be permitted to live in the fraternity the following year.

- b. It is recommended that no fraternity may pledge a student who has less than a 2.0 cumulative average. This should have the effect not only of raising the academic level of the fraternities but also may prevent a financial loss to the fraternities by losing men through academic dismissal.

3. Internal structure and organization:

- a. It is recommended that a post of Assistant Dean of Men for Fraternity Affairs be created, possibly as a half-time position. It will be the responsibility of the Assistant Dean to supervise all matters pertaining to fraternity affairs.
- b. It is recommended that membership in the Interfraternity Council be increased to two members from each house, at least one of whom shall be the President, Vice-President, or Past-President of the chapter. It is further recommended that the wording of the constitution and/or by-laws of the Council be re-phrased in a manner that will make it unmistakably clear that all decisions made by the Council are automatically binding upon all fraternities.
- c. It is recommended that each fraternity be provided with two advisors, one to be responsible for the over-all supervision of chapter affairs and one to be responsible inter alia for the financial affairs of the chapter. It is further recommended that a member of the University faculty be appointed to at least one of these positions, if possible, and that no one may serve as a fraternity advisor unless approved by the University. Upon his appointment each advisor should receive a letter from the President of the University in which the importance of the advisor's role in the fraternity and University system will be stressed.

- d. It is recommended that the Trustees broaden the scope of their 1909 resolution forbidding the hazing of freshmen by sophomores to include the hazing of fraternity pledges. For the purposes of this report the Committee defines hazing as "any physical or mental harrassment or humiliation." It is further recommended that should any fraternity be guilty of a violation of this rule its charter will be withdrawn.
 - e. It is recommended that all fraternities be required to conduct and complete their initiation ceremonies before the end of the third week of the fall semester.
 - f. It is recommended that each fraternity be required to inform the Trustees in writing of the existence, or non-existence, of any clause in their national or local constitution and/or by-laws which denies membership to persons because of their race, color, or creed. Should such a clause exist at either level, the fraternity saddled with such a clause will report yearly to the Trustees on efforts at both levels to eliminate such clauses. If at the end of five years the clauses are not eliminated at both levels, the fraternity's charter will be withdrawn. In a case where a chapter is willing to eliminate such clauses but is prevented from doing so by its national organization, it will be given the option of becoming a "local" fraternity.
4. Other suggestions: While the Committee has been concerned largely with making broad and general recommendations and has been reluctant to make recommendations concerned with specific, day to day, operations of fraternity affairs, a number of proposals and suggestions have come to its attention which are worth noting here:

- a. Assuming that one aspect of the "new role" that the fraternities must play is an academic and scholarly one, it is suggested that each fraternity, working with one or more faculty members (plus, of course, any Scholarship Advisors which they may have), submit to the Assistant Dean for Fraternity Affairs a plan for inaugurating a program linked in some way to the University's academic and scholarly activities... the plan to be carried out within the house and by its own members. Projects might include programs for building libraries concerned with specific subjects, seminars to be conducted for credit on subjects not normally listed in the University catalogue, etc. Plans for projects such as these would be in addition to the normal efforts made for improving the academic records of the members. At the end of each academic year the fraternities might submit to the Assistant Dean a report on the previous year's work and plans for the following year.
- b. In an effort, amongst other things, to make chaperoning a more pleasant task and thus easing the problem of obtaining chaperones, the affairs of all mixed parties should be limited to the main floor of the fraternity house.
- c. The fraternity advisors should form a committee to make a thorough study and re-examination of fraternity room and board charges. As noted elsewhere, it is doubtful that the fraternities can match dormitory charges and remain solvent.
- d. The fraternities should make a concerted effort to inaugurate a co-operative food-buying program.
- e. A major source of weakness in the fraternity system is the lack of enthusiastic alumni financial support. Whether the fraternity alumni are reluctant to come to the aid of the active chapters or whether the active chapters and house corporations have been reluctant to

launch vigorous fund raising campaigns is unclear. Both factors are probably involved. The Committee feels that an energetic, carefully planned, fund-raising campaign might produce more money than the fraternities think. The campaign could be linked to the drawing up of plans recommended in Section 1, a, b, and c.

- f. The Committee has held two meetings with the Interfraternity Council as a whole and one meeting with its executive committee. We have found these meetings extremely useful, as did, we believe, the IFC members. A format should be found within which similar and regular meetings with appropriate faculty and administration personnel can be held in the future. This may serve to alleviate one of the fraternity system's greatest problems...the unsympathetic, if not downright hostile, faculty member.
- g. It might be useful five years hence to re-activate this Committee, or a similar group, for the purpose of ascertaining what changes have occurred within the fraternity during the intervening years.
- h. In one of its more visionary moments, the Committee toyed with the idea of a long-range program looking forward to a more rational reorganization of the entire physical plant of the fraternity system. We envisioned a complex of modern individual fraternity units centered around a "fraternity commons". A single large kitchen would provide meals for all fraternity men, who would eat as fraternity groups in separate dining rooms. The land area between the present "fraternity row" and the river would be cleared and made into lawns and playing fields. Each house would be a separate unit but would be built according to a common plan and with common material. Rationally planned study rooms and libraries would be included in each unit. Quarters would be provided for Resident Fellows, recruited from the faculty. Should it

develop that the fraternities are unwilling or unable to measure up to the new world around them, these units could be converted into quarters for graduate students, centers for international living, honors centers, and a host of other uses. It is not inconceivable that foundation support for such a project might be obtained.

SUMMARY

To recapitulate...

The Committee has found that in general the fraternity system contributes little to the purposes and values of The University of Maine. This is partly a result of the fact that the academic pace and tone of University has accelerated markedly since the end of World War II, the fraternities not keeping up, and partly a result of a general decline of the system itself. In any case the academic and intellectual world has passed the fraternities by - they have become anachronisms.

This being the case, what is to be done?

One course of action would be simply to abolish the system. There are two difficulties here. In the first place the University would then be saddled with sixteen fraternity houses, a majority of which are in poor condition and would require extensive renovation before they could be used as housing for Maine students. Secondly, a number of houses do contribute to the purposes and values of the University, and it would be unfortunate to penalize them for the sins of the others.

Another course of action would be to ignore the whole problem and wait for the fraternity system to die of its own accord. The difficulty here is that in the meantime hundreds of Maine students are living in less than adequate housing, in an anti-intellectual atmosphere, and in a condition of increasing demoralization.

A third course of action would be to take the existing system, with its sixteen houses and approximately 1,000 members (only about one-half of whom live in their chapter houses), and seek to make of it something which actually does contribute to the purposes and values of the University. The Committee feels that a fraternity system, properly organized and motivated, can play a useful role at Maine, and by setting certain standards and insisting that the fraternities live up to those standards, it might be possible to create something on the University campus of which we could all be proud. The Committee recommends this course of action.

Professor W. Murray Bain
Professor Cecil S. Brown
Professor Llewellyn E. Clark
(on leave, 1963-1964)
Professor Hilda M. Fife
Professor Matthew McNeary
Professor John J. Nolde, Chairman
Professor Robert B. Rhoads

January, 1964

